

Applicant: Huang  
Application No.: 10/001,318

### REMARKS

Claims 1 and 5-9 are amended to clarify the present invention's elements. The original claim 4 and the Specification support the amendments without introducing any new matter. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the present patent application is respectfully requested.

#### REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 102

The Action rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Bartelloni et al. patent (U.S. Patent 4,510,019), Hoffman (U.S. Patent 5,061,345), or Watson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,447,640), and Reiner et al. patent (U.S. Patent 6,344,110). The Action also rejected Claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Holloway (U.S. Patent 6,446,386).

None of these references show or suggest what is now claimed. Claim 1 now recites a method of manufacturing a multi-purpose paper, which comprises steps of: (a) providing a papermaking material and obtaining a clean paper pulp by treating said papermaking material; (b) adding at least one functional additive into said clean paper pulp, wherein said functional additive is Camellia seed cake's powder or Camellia seed cake's powder combined with at least one functional additive selected from a group consisting of calcium carbonate, dry strength agent, wet strength agent, weed control agent, pest control agent, bacterial control agent and a combination thereof; (c) processing plural steps including classifying, pulp-

**Applicant: Huang**  
**Application No.: 10/001,318**

dispersing, coarse pulp-clarifying, fiber-separation, coarse screening, fine pulp-clarifying, heat-dispersion, fine screening, bleaching, pulp-washing and pulp-refining steps to form said multi-purpose paper; and (d) processing said multi-purpose paper to form thereon an uneven surface structure.

None of the references disclose all of the functional additives that include Camellia seed cake's powder, calcium carbonate, dry strength agent, wet strength agent, weed control agent, pest control agent, bacterial control agent, or a combination thereof. More specifically, none of the cited references disclose Camellia seed cake's powder. Each of the cited references is discussed in more detail below.

(a) Bartelloni et al. (U.S. Patent 4,510,019) discloses latex containing papers that contain various amounts of latex and therefore have allegedly improved properties. Although the Bartelloni discloses the use of cellulosic fibers (Col. 6, lines 16-28), the functional additive is "latex," which is completely different from the additives claimed. Other than that, with regard to the disclosed embossed structure in example IV-4 indicated by the Examiner, the embossed structure is used in artificial leather (Col. 31, lines 12-37), not paper.

(b) Hoffman (U.S. Patent 5,061,345) discloses a method of producing multi-ply paper product, which utilizes reclaimed office paper to produce a multiple ply, high strength, paper product. The Action states that Hoffman discloses the use

**Applicant: Huang**  
**Application No.: 10/001,318**

of waste pulp, the pH of the paper, and the processing steps. However, the processing steps disclosed in Hoffman (Col. 5, line 35-Col. 6 line 21) are not the same as those claimed, i.e., there is no step of fiber-separation or fine pulp-clarifying as claimed in claim 1. Most importantly, Hoffman does not disclose the same functional additive as claimed in the application, i.e. Camellia seed cake's powder.

(c) Watson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,447,640) discloses a process for making an absorbent sheet. Watson discloses an embossed structure and the use of waste pulp for making the absorbent sheet. However, Watson does not show or suggest anything relevant to the claimed functional additives is taught or suggested.

(d) Reiner et al. (U.S. Patent 6,344,110) discloses a method of producing a paper having a 3-dimensional structure. Similar to the above, the Reiner et al. patent discloses the embossed structure and the use of recovery pulp. However, it does not show or suggest the claimed functional additives.

(e) Holloway (U.S. Patent 6,446,386) discloses seed germination medium, which is used as an environment for encouraging the germination and establishment of seeds. The Examiner alleges that the medium structure disclosed in the Holloway patent is similar to the claimed paper. However, none of the functional additives is disclosed or suggested in Holloway Patent, i.e., Camellia seed cake's powder, bacterial control agent, or the processing steps of fine pulp-clarifying

**Applicant: Huang**  
**Application No.: 10/001,318**

and pulp-refining. Obviously, the claimed invention can not be anticipated simply by Holloway patent since anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art disclosure of **all elements** of a claimed invention arranged as in the claim. *Soundsciber Crop. v. U.S.*, 360 F.2d 954, 960 (Ct. Claims 1966).

The test for determining anticipation under Section 102(b) requires that the same or virtually identical device or invention has been previously disclosed in a **single** prior structure, patent or description. *Arnel Industries, Inc. v. Aerosol Research Company*, 164 USPQ, 239, 244 (N.D. Illinois, E. Div. 1969). Nevertheless, none of the 5 references cited in the Action disclose all of the claim limitations. Since the cited prior art does not disclose all of the claim limitations of the present invention, the claims are not anticipated.

Even a combination of the 5 prior arts cited by the Examiner does not render the claims obvious since none of the references show or suggest the functional additives, i.e. Camellia seed cake's powder and bacterial control agent. Camellia seed cake's powder, in fact, is used for preventing golden apple snails (*Pomacea Canaliculata* Lamarck) and increasing dispersive level of fibers during manufacturing.

Based on the above differences, the claims are patentable over the art cited. Thus, one person skilled in the art would not be taught or suggested through the prior art disclosure to conceive the present invention. Accordingly, the claims 1-2,

**Applicant: Huang**  
**Application No.: 10/001,318**

5-33 and 41 are patentable over the 5 cited references listed in the outstanding Office Action.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 103**

The Examiner rejected Claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Holloway (U.S. Patent 6,446,386).

Since Claim 1 is patentable as described in the above, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 41 can be patentable owing to their dependency from the patentable Claim 1.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the presently claimed invention is patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Ching-Chung Huang

By Stephen B. Schott  
Stephen B. Schott  
Registration No. 51,294  
(215) 568-6400

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.  
United Plaza, Suite 1600  
30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

SBS